

## **MINUTES**

### **CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC) MEETING**

**Oakland, February 15, 2007**

The first CTCDC meeting of the year 2007 was held in Oakland, on February 15, 2007.

Chairman Farhad Mansourian opened the meeting at 9:15 a.m. with the introduction of Committee members and guests. Chairman Mansourian thanked Caltrans District 4 for hosting the meeting. The following Members, alternates and guests were in attendance:

<b><u>ATTENDANCE</u></b>	<b><u>ORGANIZATION</u></b>	<b><u>TELEPHONE</u></b>
<b>Members (Voting)</b>		
Farhad Mansourian Chairman	CA State Association of Counties Marin County	(415) 499-6570
John Fisher	League of CA Cities City of Los Angeles	(213) 972-8424
Devinder Singh (Alternate)	Caltrans	(916) 654-4551
Ed von Borstel	League of CA Cities City of Modesto	(209) 577-5266
Merry Banks	California State Automobile Association	(415) 565-2297
Jacob Babico	CA State Association of Counties San Bernardino County	(909) 387-8186
Joe Whiteford	CHP	(916) 657-7222
<b><u>Alternate</u></b>		
Deborah Wong	California State Automobile Association	(415) 241-5847

**ATTENDEES**

**ORGANIZATION**

**TELEPHONE/E-Mail**

Ahmad Rastegarpour

Caltrans

[ahmad\\_rastegarpour@dot.ca.gov](mailto:ahmad_rastegarpour@dot.ca.gov)

George Allen

City of Garden Grove

Matt Schmitz

FHWA

Radiaht Victor

MTC

[rvictor@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:rvictor@mtc.ca.gov)

Lance Miller

Town of Apple Valley

[lmiller@applevalley.org](mailto:lmiller@applevalley.org)

Joren Kroll

SF MTA-DPT

[joren.kroll@sfmta.com](mailto:joren.kroll@sfmta.com)

Johnny Bhullar

Caltrans

[johnny\\_bhullar@dot.ca.gov](mailto:johnny_bhullar@dot.ca.gov)

Ricardo Olen

City/County of SF

[ricardo.olea@sfmta.com](mailto:ricardo.olea@sfmta.com)

Eric Douglas

Walgreen Co.

[eric.douglass@walgreen.com](mailto:eric.douglass@walgreen.com)

Roger Bazeley

SF – PTA

[bazeley@earthlink.net](mailto:bazeley@earthlink.net)

Maurice Palumbo

Golden Gate Br. Dist.

[Mpalumbo@goldengate.org](mailto:Mpalumbo@goldengate.org)

Charles Gray

CHP

[cgray@chp.ca.gov](mailto:cgray@chp.ca.gov)

Alan Fisher

H.S.P.D.

[fisherbydesign@aol.com](mailto:fisherbydesign@aol.com)

(714) 901-9110

Jessica Manzi

SFMTA

[jessica.manzi@sfmta.com](mailto:jessica.manzi@sfmta.com)

Arhor Lake

Lake Traffic Solutions

[alake@laketraffic.com](mailto:alake@laketraffic.com)

Kevin Schumacher

CPUC

[shk@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:shk@cpuc.ca.gov)

## **MINUTES**

Adoption of October 26, 2006 CTCDC meeting minutes.

**Motion:** Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by Ed von Borstel, to adopt the Minutes of the October 26, 2006 CTCDC meeting held in San Diego, California. Motion carried 6-0.

### **Membership**

Chairman Mansourian stated that Hamid Bahadori has resigned from the Committee because he has accepted employment with the City of Los Alamitos as a Director of Public Works/City Engineer. The Chairman also announced that Gerry Meis' replacement Mike Bauer would be representing Caltrans in future meetings. Devinder Singh acted as Voting Member since Mike Bauer was not able to attend the meeting due to prior commitments.

### **3. Public Comments:**

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments on any items not appearing on the agenda.

There were no public comments.

### **Agenda Items**

#### **4. Public Hearing**

##### **02-15 Radar Guided Dynamic Curve Warning Sign**

Chairman Mansourian asked Devinder Singh to address agenda item 02-15, Curve Warning Sign.

Devinder stated that during the October 2006 CTCDC meeting, the Committee asked Caltrans to develop a policy for the Changeable Message Sign (CMS) which could be supplemented with curve warning signs and bring policy for the Committee's consideration. Devinder pointed out that Section 2C.06, Horizontal Alignment Signs, of the CA MUTCD has been amended to include the use of CMS. The CMS sign will display the horizontal alignment with the advisory speed and the approaching vehicle speed. The amended text is as follows:

#### **Standard: (Existing CA MUTCD Language)**

**When engineering judgment determines the need for a horizontal alignment sign, one of the W1-1 through W1-5, W1-10, W1-11 or W1-15 signs shall be used.**

Option:

If the reduction in speed is 20 km/h (15 mph) or greater, a supplemental combination Horizontal Alignment/Advisory Speed sign ~~or Curve Speed (W13-5) sign~~ may be installed as near as practical to the point of curvature. If the reduction in speed is 40 km/h (25 mph) or greater, one or more additional Curve Speed signs may be installed along the curve.

(New Language approved by the CTCDC during the February 15, 2007 Meeting)

A changeable message sign that displays to approaching drivers the speed at which they are traveling may be installed on the same post and in conjunction with any horizontal alignment sign that has an advisory speed.

Any horizontal alignment that has an advisory speed may be supplemented with a changeable message sign that displays the horizontal alignment sign, advisory speed and the approaching driver's speed.

**Standard:**

If a changeable message sign is installed, the legend YOUR SPEED XX (MPH) or such similar legend shall be shown. The color of the changeable message sign should be a yellow legend on a black background or the reverse of these colors.

**Standard:** (Existing CA MUTCD Language)

The advisory speed shall be determined in accordance with Section 2C.101(CA).

**Guidance:**

The Winding Road (W1-5) sign should be used where there is a series of turns or curves which requires driving caution, and where curve or turn signs would be too numerous to be effective. This sign should be erected in advance of the second curve of the winding section of highway. The first curve should be marked with a curve or turn sign and an Advisory Speed (W13-1) plaque. Where the winding road is 1.6 km (1 mi) or more in length, a Next Distance (W7-3a) plaque should supplement the W1-5 sign. Where any of the curves has an advisory speed that is 15 km/h (10 mph) or more below that of the first curve then it should be posted with a curve or turn sign and an Advisory Speed (W13-1) plaque.

**Option:**

The WINDING LEVEE ROAD (SW22-1(CA)) sign may be used to warn road users of the roadway alignment where the use of curve warning signs have been determined not to be appropriate.

The Speed/Distance (SW22-1A(CA)) plaque may be installed below the SW22-1(CA) sign. The Next Distance (W7-3a) plaque may be used when there is no advisory speed.

**Standard:**

If used, the Speed/Distance (SW22-1A(CA)) plaque shall be installed below the SW22-1(CA) sign.

**Support:**

See Figure 2C-1(CA) for the SW22-1(CA) and SW22-1A(CA) signs.

Chairman Mansourian opened the item for public comments.

There were none.

Chairman Mansourian opened the discussion amongst Committee members.

Jacob Babico stated that the proposed policy might have too much information and drivers may be not be able to retain the information.

Chairman Mansourian stated that it is up to traffic engineers to come up with a message that would be readable for the motorists.

Devinder stated that there will be two alternating messages displayed. The first message would be the horizontal alignment with advisory speed, then the follow-up message with the approaching vehicle's speed.

There were no other comments.

**Motion:** Moved by Ed von Borstel, seconded by Merry Banks, recommended that Caltrans adopt the proposed policy for the CMS.

Motion Carried 6-0.

**Action:** Item is completed and Caltrans will post the final policy on the CA MUTCD website.

## **O6-7 MUTCD Revision No. I, Pharmacy Signing**

Chairman Mansourian asked Devinder Singh to address agenda item 06-7 Pharmacy signing.

Devinder stated that during the last meeting, the Committee asked Caltrans and Walgreens to bring policy on the pharmacy signing for the Committee's consideration. Devinder stated that there is a proposed pharmacy signing policy on page 7 through 11 of the agenda packet. The proposed policy recommends a generic sign (RX sign white on blue) to be used on the highways as well as for the trailblazer signs. The policy will not allow the use of the logo program, because the California Streets and Highway Codes only allows four types of logo signs (fuel, lodging, camping and food).

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the public.

Eric Douglas, Walgreens, stated that Walgreens initiated the request to change the California statute to add pharmacy signing as logo signing. Eric further added that there are 23 states who have adopted the pharmacy signing in rural areas and it is a logo program. He recommended that the item be placed on hold, and after they have legislation to add pharmacies as a logo program, then they will request opening this item again and allowing the logo program to be use pharmacy signing in rural areas only.

Peter Kellison, Walgreens, also requested to table the item until they receive an amendment to the Streets and Highway Code including pharmacy signing as a logo program.

Johnny Bhullar added that the proposed policy is the MUTCD language, which was a strikeout before, and now it is included in CA MUTCD Section 2D.45 and 2E.51. Section 2F.1, which talks about attractions (logo program), is not included because, the California law allows for only fuel, lodging, camping, and food as logo signing.

Chairman Mansourian suggested to the Committee members that there are two options, either to adopt the generic sign as proposed, or table this item and wait for Walgreens to come back with the amendment to the Streets and Highway Code.

The Committee members agreed to table the item.

**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommended to table the item until Walgreens comes back to put the item back on the agenda.

Motion carried 7-0.

**Action:** Item will be tabled.

## **O6-8 FHWA's Interim Approval for Optional Use of Flashing Yellow Arrow (FYA)**

Chairman Mansourian stated that during the last meeting the Committee recommended Caltrans to request blanket approval for all the CA agencies for the use of FYA. However, Caltrans Electrical Branch raised operational and safety concerns and decided to bring it back to the Committee for further discussion. Chairman Mansourian asked Ahmad Rastegarpour to address this item.

Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that he presented his comments during the October meeting and his concerns are the same. He stated that he has concerns with the phasing sequence as issued by FHWA. The left turn movement has solid yellow arrow (SYA) and opposing through traffic has yellow ball (YB) which is a conflict. This type of operation is not used at any signalized intersections currently. He pointed out to the Committee that page 13 of the agenda packet has a revised sequence which eliminates the conflict and suggested that the Committee adopt FYA with the revised sequence. The modified sequence adds two extra phases, and it would add a few extra seconds to the cycle length. However, this will be a safe operation. The Caltrans statewide signal committee, including 12 districts, practitioners, and field staff, unanimously supports the proposed sequence. Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that the primary role of the signals is to provide safe movement.

Chairman Mansourian asked whether Caltrans unanimously supports this concept.

Devinder stated that this is a signal operation issue and Caltrans leaves it up to the electrical branch.

Chairman Mansourian asked if the Committee members have any questions for Ahmad.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

There were none.

Chairman Mansourian asked Committee comments.

Jacob Babico stated that the modified sequence could add 3 to 5 seconds extra for each direction and he does not believe whether Caltrans has analyzed the congestion impact by adding extra time to the cycle length.

Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that normally the FYA is used for the main line and it could add 5-10 seconds to the cycle.

John Fisher stated that he shares the same concerns at the beginning when concept was proposed by the FHWA as Ahmad outlined. He stated that he was concerned that one motorist will see SYA and another will see a YB, which brings question of who has the right of way. Under normal operation, SYA will have the right of way. However in this case, the motorist first sees FYA, that is a permissive movement, then they see SYA, and motorist understands that they need to yield to oncoming traffic. The report issued by Jeff Paniati of the FHWA indicates that motorists have a high level of understanding and correct response by the left turn traffic. Based on the FHWA reports and agencies who have used or are using this operation have not encountered the concern Ahmad has raised. He also stated that the Committee has authorized experimentation with FHWA guidelines to the City of Pasadena and Fullerton.

John Fisher further stated that if there is any evidence of misinterpretation, then he would support Ahmad's proposal. However, all the agencies using this operation and the FHWA indicates that there are no misunderstanding to the motorists.

Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that the concern is consistency, there is no other signal using this type of operation. A driver following a big vehicle might not see the prior indication and sees only SYA and he/she will assume they have a protected movement.

John Fisher stated that modified sequence would add 5-10 seconds to the cycle, which would defeat the purpose of the use of a FYA.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the safety concerns raised by Caltrans seems to have an edge over the congestion.

Jacob Babico stated that FHWA has done extensive studies, and they have issued IA for the use of FYA. However, a modified sequence is not supported by any study, and at the same time, FHWA has not seen any accidents with this operation.

Ahmad suggested that the modified sequence is terminating the FYA with safe manner.

Devinder stated that if the Committee adopts the modified version, then the Committee needs to inform the City of Pasadena and Fullerton about their decision.

Chairman Mansourian stated that he considers safety over congestion and he moved the motion to adopt the proposed sequence as suggested by Caltrans.

However, no Committee member seconded the motion and motion failed.

John Fisher asked whether the City of Fullerton and Pasadena submitted their report to the Committee on the experimentation.

Devinder responded that according to the guidelines issued by FHWA, agencies are not required to submit any data on the IAs.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the Committee might not take further action.

Johnny Bhullar stated that during the last meeting the Committee requested Caltrans to ask for blanket approval from FHWA. When Caltrans discussed this request in-house, Ahmad Rastegarpour raised the same safety concerns which were raised during the CTCDC meeting in October 2006. Caltrans decided to bring the item back to the Committee for further discussion. Now, if the Committee takes no action, it means the previous motion is still valid.

John Fisher stated that he would like to propose a motion.

**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, requested Caltrans to apply for blanket approval for the IA issued on the use of FYA for all California agencies.

Chairman Mansourian asked for discussion on the motion.

Chairman Mansourian stated that Caltrans could again decide not to seek blanket approval.

John Fisher stated that it is a Committee's responsibility to make recommendations to Caltrans, if they elect not seek blanket approval, let them to justify.

Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that the City of Pasadena has requested to use FYA at one of the intersections with a state route which was approved by the CTCD previously. However, Caltrans has denied their request due to safety reasons.

John Fisher stated that Caltrans could use extra safety features on their roadways. The MUTCD does not prohibit using extra safety features. However, the local agencies do not want to use what was being suggested.

Motion carried 6-1 (Devinder Singh abstained).



### **06-13 Proposal to Amend Section 7B.08 and 7B.12 (School Zone Signs)**

Chairman Mansourian asked John Fisher to address the agenda item proposal to amend Section 7B.08 and 7B.12 of the CA MUTCD.

John Fisher stated that the City of Santa Ana would not be able to attend the meeting. However, the City has asked him to discuss this item during the meeting. John stated that the City of Santa Ana proposed to amend Section 7B.08 and 7B.12 to use S4-5 and S4-5a signs instead of Assembly D to warn motorists that they are approaching a school zones with reduced speed limit. The City of Santa Ana believes that S4-5 and S4-5a would be more effective than Assembly D. John stated that someone could argue that diamond signs are more effective in school ahead areas and motorists understand that they are approaching the school zone. John further stated that Assembly D is required by the MUTCD in advance of the school zone where speed reduction is applicable. He would like to get the Committee members opinion on this proposal.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Roger Bazely, PTA San Francisco (SF), stated that uniformity and readability is the key for school zone signs. He further added that S4-5 and S4-5a signs have a lot of words and that school diamond signs are symbol sign and are more recognizable by motorists. He stated that he is supportive of less word signs and more symbol signs because motorists easily recognize symbols.

There were no other comments from the public.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion amongst the Committee members. Chairman Mansourian pointed out Page 7B-8 of the CA MUTCD and stated that the proposal in front of the Committee is to replace Assembly D with S4-5 and S4-5a signs.

John Fisher stated that Assembly D is required by the MUTCD in advance of school zones where speed is higher than 25 mph, and the City of Santa Ana is proposing to use S4-5 or S4-5a instead of Assembly D. The question is, would S4-5 or S4-5a be more readable and recognizable compared to the Assembly D. Some one could argue that Assemble D is more intuitive and notable because of the pentagon symbol, whereas S4-5 and S4-5a have Assembly C embedded within the diamond sign.

Jacob Babico stated that in the CA MUTCD, page 7B-10 and page 7B-12, Assembly D is required in advance of the school crosswalk only, it is not required in school zones where speed reduction is applicable.

John Fisher stated that Assembly D is required according to the MUTCD and CA MUTCD in the school zone in advance of any school crosswalk warning Assembly B, school crosswalk Assembly E or the school speed limit Assembly C. John further stated that another alternative is to ask the City of Santa Ana to conduct experimentation with proposed signs and compare with the current signs to see whether the new sign have better recognition.

Merry Banks stated that she would support the idea to conduct experimentation with the proposed signs and see whether the motorists favor the proposed or current signs.

Chairman Mansourian stated that during the last meeting his understanding was that the City of Santa Ana wants to use fewer signs in school zones where the speed limit is already 25 mph. In that case, they want to eliminate some signs. However, the proposal has been changed, and instead they proposed to use S4-5 or S4-5a signs in lieu of Assembly D. He stated that he would support the idea to conduct

experimentation. In the event the City does not agree to the experimental option, he suggested checking with the City to see if they would consider withdrawing the item from the agenda.

There were no other comments.

**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Devinder Singh, suggesting that the City of Santa Ana to consider conducting experiment with the S4-5 and S4-5a signs and compare with the current signs to see which are better recognized to the motorists.

Motion carried 7-0.

**Action:** The CTCDC Secretary will ask the City of Santa Ana, if they would consider Committee's suggestion.

**07-1 Proposal to revise the sizes for the Supplemental School Plaques (S4-3, W16-7p and W16-9p)**

Chairman Mansourian asked John Fisher to address the agenda item on supplemental school plaque signs.

John Fisher stated that the City of Santa Ana also brought this item to the Committee. This relates to the supplemental plaques used with the school advance warning signs. The school advance warning assembly (S1-1) sign has a variety of messages such as SCHOOL plaque (S4-3), AHEAD plaque (W16-9p), diagonal plaque (W16-7p) and X FEET plaque (W16-2). The sizes of the supplemental plaques are not consistent and the illustration in Figure 7B-1(CA) School Area Signs shows that S4-3, W16-7p and W16-9p plaques are as wide as the S1-1, however, the dimensions listed in Table 7B-1 are not consistent with the figures. Additionally, the "school" plaque is shown as relatively smaller in width compared to the S1-1 sign and even smaller "School" plaque of 12 x 6" is allowed in the table. By comparison, the "Ahead" plaque is much more legible since it has fewer characters and its conventional size is 24 x 12" instead of 24 x 8" for the "School" plaque. John suggested that the relative size of the "School" plaque should probably be the same width as the S1-1, while the "Ahead" plaque should probably be smaller in width than the S1-1 signs. In general, John suggested that all sign sizes should be reviewed and modified based on the relative importance of each sign and for consistency in Table 7B-1(CA). John recommended that Caltrans come up with a proposal which addresses all tables, figures, and other graphics be revised to consistently represent the relative sizes of the plaques below the S1-1 signs. He suggested that Caltrans should communicate with Committee members while revising these signs to work efficiently on this task.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Roger Bazely, PTA, San Francisco, suggested using the supplemental plaque widths that are the same as the S1-1 sign. He further stated that simple is better and stressed that readability and that uniformity is essential.

George Allen, City of Garden Grove, stated that their City is using bigger downward arrows and they are receiving positive feedback from the public. He suggested the revised policy also give discretion to the engineers to modify the supplemental plaque sizes based on their field judgement.

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans, stated that this item is a part of the overall inconsistency. He suggested that there should be a task to combine the federal highway signs specifications with Caltrans sign specifications. During the previous meetings, it has been stated that even though Caltrans is working on these minor issues, there is no effort to combine the federal sign specifications with California sign specifications. On this particular item Caltrans would work and resolve the size issues.

Chairman Mansourian asked Johnny Bhullar if he would address the question raised by George Allen to give discretion to engineers to adjust the size of the supplemental plaque downward arrowhead.

Johnny Bhullar responded that the sign specifications are based on different roadway classifications, and the sizes could be picked based on the roadway classification or even an agency could pick oversized sign specifications.

John Fisher asked Johnny Bhullar whether he needs direction from the Committee on the subject to combine federal sign specifications and California signs specifications.

Johnny stated that this needs to be elevated to Caltrans Management, in particular at the level of Mike Bauer who has taken Gerry Meis' position.

Devinder suggested if the Committee wants, he can put this issue on the agenda for the up coming meeting.

John Fisher stated that the issue related to school zone signs is urgent and it needs to be address expediently. Because the jurisdiction is going to initiate upgrade school signs shortly since the target date for compliance is 2011. There will be no crosswalk lines on the sign and it will be replaced by a downward arrow. The sooner the jurisdiction has guidance, the better.

Johnny suggested that the focus should be on all the signs which are approaching the target date of compliance.

There were no other comments. There were two motions presented to the committee in regards to this item.

**Motion:** Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommended that the school zone supplement plaque sign be reviewed and revised as suggested by the Committee and the City of Santa Ana.

Motion carried 7-0.

**Action:** Caltrans will develop a draft on this proposal and work with the Committee to finalize.

**Motion:** Moved by Merry Bank, seconded by Jacob Babico, recommended Caltrans consider reviewing all the signs which are approaching to the compliance dates.

Motion carried 7-0.

**Action:** Caltrans will work on this task and keep the Committee informed.

### **07-2 Three (3) Proposed Roadway Regulatory Signs**

Chairman Mansourian asked John Fisher to address agenda item regulatory signs proposed by the Town of Apple Valley.

John Fisher stated that the Town of Apple Valley has proposed three regulatory signs and asking that the Committee make a recommendation to Caltrans to adopt them as official signs. The signs will be placed at the city limits and would not be installed on individual streets, because the signs installed at the City limits will warn the motorists about the prohibition. The first sign is:

NO PARKING OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES- EXCEPT BY PERMIT

John Fisher stated that the California Vehicle Code Section 22505 and 22507 does allow this type of signs.

The second sign is:

COMMERCIAL VEHICLES OVER 5 TONS PROHIBITED EXCEPT ON THROUGH  
AND LOCAL TRUCK ROUTES.

And the third sign is:

DISPLAY OF VEHICLES FOR SALE PROHIBITED BY LOCAL ORDINANCE

John Fisher stated that “ DISPLAY OF VEHICLES FOR SALE PROHIBITED” is covered in the Streets and Highway Code. The Streets and Highway Code prohibits the sale of vehicles on highways. John Fisher stated that he does have minor comments on the format. John invited Lance Miller, Town of Apple Valley, to address the proposal to the Committee.

Lance Miller stated that the Town of Apple Valley presently displays the proposed signs at all local roadway entries into the corporate boundaries of the Town. The purpose of the signs is to inform the motoring public of three (3) specific regulations enforced within the Town regarding public displaying or advertising of vehicles for sale, the adherence to truck routes, and the parking of commercial vehicles. Besides entrance into the Town upon various local collector roads, the Town is also entered at two (2) locations upon California State Highway 18 (SR18), which is prevailed upon by Caltrans. In order to obtain an Encroachment Permit for sign installation, Caltrans requires that any signage displayed within its jurisdiction be CA MUTCD approved. To avoid an over-abundance of signage, the Town would prefer to display one of each sign at the two (2) SR18 entrances, within Caltrans right-of way (ROW) to the Town, rather than at every local-roadway-access to SR18 within the Town ROW.

Lance Miller stated that the City came up with some alternatives to signs that are shown in the agenda packet, the alternative signs were handed out to the Committee members and audience. He added that many jurisdictions have indicated that they would like to use these signs. If the signs are in place at the entry point to the City, then, the signs are not needed to be placed at each exit.

Jacob Babico asked that the “COMMERCIAL VEHICLES OVER 5 TONS PROHIBITED EXCEPT ON THROUGH AND LOCAL TRUCK ROUTES” sign would be placed on the roads which are not designated as truck routes.

John Fisher stated that the sign will be installed at entry points to the City and then on the designated truck routes. The streets not to be used by trucks, there will be no sign posted under this proposal.

Lance Miller stated that CVC under the commercial sections allows local agencies to prohibit parking of commercial vehicles and commercial vehicles over 5 tons prohibited except on through and local routes.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the public.

Johnny Bhullar commented that he appreciated the Town of Apple Valley bringing these signs to the Committee and asking for approval which could be helpful for other jurisdictions if they face similar situations. This will also provide uniformity and consistency.

There were no other public comments.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion amongst Committee members.

John Fisher stated that he would suggest discussing these signs separately. There is need for a sign to prohibit parking of certain vehicles on certain streets. The CVC allows to prohibit parking of vehicle over 8' and there is no standard available in CA MUTCD. There is a need to develop standards so that the Town of Apple Valley can use this sign. John Fisher suggested adopting the sign shown as number one on the alternative page 1. The sign is shown below:



**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Jacob Babico, recommend that Caltrans adopt “No Parking Of Commercial Vehicles Except By Permit” sign.

Motion carried 7-0.

John Fisher stated that he would like to discuss next the “Display Of Vehicles For Sale Prohibited By Local Ordinance” sign. John Fisher further stated that Streets and Highway Code prohibit statewide the display of vehicles sale on public streets. He will support the adoption of the sign without the text “By Local Ordinance”. The sign is shown as follows:



**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommends that Caltrans adopt the sign, Display Of Vehicles For Sale Prohibited.”

Motion Carried 7-0.

John Fisher talked about the third proposed sign “Commercial Vehicles Over 5 Tons Prohibited Except On Through And Local Truck Routes.” John Fisher stated that the sign would advise the truckers when they enter the city that they can only use the local truck route, when that route is signed for the local truck route. In absence of sign they can not travel on that particular streets. He added that he is not clear on this proposed sign. There is an existing sign R5-2 and standards in the CA MUTCD, “No Trucks and the weight limits signs shall be placed at each end of the effected portion of a highway section They shall be placed at a distance of not more than 150 m (500 ft) from the ends of an effected bridge or structure.” If the Committee approves this sign then the amendment of the CA MUTCD is needed to include this sign.

Chairman Mansourian commented that counties could not prohibit truck unless engineering studies support the prohibition of trucks. It could be applicable on city streets, however not on county streets. Every road under the county is a truck route because the county roads are connectors between the state highways and the city streets. The sign may be applicable for one city and may not be applicable for all cities.

John Fisher further stated that the CA MUTCD page 2B-38 have standards that states:

**Standard:**

**The R5-2 signs shall be placed at each end of the affected portion of a highway section. They shall be placed at a distance of not more than 150 m (500 ft) from the ends of an affected bridge or structure.**

John Fisher stated that if the Committee is inclined to approve the sign then the CA MUTCD language needs to be amended.

Chairman Mansourian stated that he could support the sign if it works for the Town of Apple Valley, if the Town is willing to go back and bring the amended language to the Committee.

John Fisher stated that MUTCD language also has “shall” conditions and it would be difficult to deviate from MUTCD language. He stated that he is not comfortable to go with lower standards compared to the MUTCD.

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans, stated that during the adoption of the MUTCD, FHWA grandfathers previous deviation, and that any future deviation the state must go through the FHWA process.

Matt Schmitz, FHWA, stated that on word message signs, the FHWA is flexible.

John Fisher asked the Town of Apple Valley if they would consider experimentation with the proposed sign.

Lance Miller responded that the Town would not consider experimentation. This is a simple enforcement sign and the R36 (Commercial Vehicle Over 5 Tons Prohibited) sign already exist in the CA MUTCD. CVC Section 35701 allows that any city, or county for a residence district, may, by ordinance, prohibit the use of a street by any commercial vehicle or by any vehicle exceeding a maximum gross weight limit.

John Fisher noted that the Town of Apple Valley would not undertake experimentation and there is existing standards which requires amendment to the CA MUTCD with the proposed sign. Without any study it will be difficult to amend “shall” conditions.

Chairman Mansourian asked the other Committee members if they would consider changing the CA MUTCD.

None of the Committee member supported that proposal.

There were no other comments.

**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, to deny the adoption of “Commercial Vehicles Over 5 Tons Prohibited Except On Through and Local Truck Routes” sign as requested by the Town of Apple Valley.

Motion carried 7-0.

**Action:** Caltrans will inform the Committee when standards and specification of the signs will be developed.



**07-3 FHWA's Interim Approvals to Display more than Six Specific Service Logo Panels for a Type of Service**

Chairman Mansourian asked Devinder Singh to address the agenda item interim approval (IA) issued by FHWA.

Devinder stated that FHWA has issued IA on Specific Service Logo panels, which allows states to install a 12 logo panel instead of the currently approved six logo panels. This is a may condition. Devinder stated that he has discussed this IA with the responsible office within Caltrans, and they supported the concept. Devinder asked the Committee if they would consider making a recommendation to Caltrans to seek blanket approval from FHWA for the State of California. This IA would mainly be used on State Highways in rural areas.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the public.

Johnny Bhullar stated that whenever there is an interim approval issued by the FHWA, Caltrans would bring it to the Committee the very next meeting for discussion, and if Committee agrees then Caltrans will seek a blanket approval for all of California. By doing so, Caltrans and the Committee will review the IA to see if FHWA guidelines are acceptable to use in California, or if there's need for any modification. This will be a proactive approach.

There were no other public comments.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the Committee members.

There were none.

**Motion:** Moved by Ed von Borstel, seconded by Joe Whiteford, recommended Caltrans to ask for blanket approval for the 12 logo panels program as Interim Approval issued by the FHWA.

Motion carried by 7-0.

**Action:** Caltrans will request blanket approval from the FHWA.

#### **07-4 Proposal to Adopt “Transporting Fireworks Prohibited” Sign**

Chairman Mansourian stated that there is a letter from the Board of Supervisors, County of San Bernardino in support of this proposed sign. He asked Jacob Babico to address the agenda item Transporting Fireworks Prohibited.

Jacob Babico stated that the County of San Bernardino has requested for the approval of a sign which prohibits the transporting of the fireworks from the State of Nevada to California. He added that there are numerous activities to transport fireworks from the State of Nevada to California through the County of San Bernardino. Last year over 33 tons of illegal fireworks were confiscated in San Bernardino County in a few weeks by the statewide law enforcement task force. The Supervisors of San Bernardino wants to install two signs on State Route 127, one north of Baker community and another south of the Inyo County to prohibit transporting of fireworks to California through the County of San Bernardino. Jacob noted that there were 15 letters written to the Committee from different agencies in support of a sign. Jacob Babico stated that there is a standard signs, “hazardous material prohibited” and this signs can be easily modified to install “Transporting of Fireworks Prohibited”.

Chairman Mansourian read the names of agencies for the record who wrote letters in support of approval of a sign. The following agencies supported the idea:

Apple Valley Fire Protection District, Fontana Police department, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, County of San Bernardino Fire Department, City of Redlands, Chino Valley Independent Fire District, City of Rialto Fire Department, Running Spring Fire Department, City of Big Bear Lake, City of Ontario and Barstow Fire Department.

The following individual also supported the sign:

Senator Roy Ashburn, Mayor Mark Nuaimi, City of Fontana, Gary Penrod, Sheriff, County of San Bernardino and Board of Supervisors, City of Upland.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Roger Bazely stated that there may be a need for the signs at the California border lines indicating that transporting of illegal fireworks prohibited.

Matt Schmitz stated that he understand the necessity of the sign. However, there are number of things are illegal to transport, such as, illegal drugs, kidnapping, should be there a sign for all categories.

Joe Whiteford stated that in certain conditions, a sign is a necessity to apply the law, e.g., U-turn is prohibited, red light enforcement. Without a sign, it is not enforceable.

Matt Schmtiz stated that the purpose of signs is to regulate, to warn, or to guide. This sign is not a traffic control device.

There were no more public comments.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion among Committee members.

John Fisher stated that there are agencies in California who allows fire works in their city limits. The proposed sign will prohibit transporting of legal fireworks too. Is there a State law, which prohibits transporting of fireworks?

Jacob Babico pointed out in the first paragraph, the last sentence of a letter written by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, which says, “The importation, possession and use of these fireworks in the State of California is forbidden by the California Health and Safety Code.”

Joe Whiteford stated that in most of the cities in the Sacramento region do allow fireworks on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. He believes the sign should say, “Transportation of Illegal Fireworks Prohibited.”

John Fisher stated that if the sign is modified to say “Transportation of Illegal Fireworks Prohibited”, then he can support.

The Committee members had a lengthy discussion about what is an appropriate message for use and it was decided the message should be “Transporting Illegal Fireworks Prohibited”.

**Motion:** Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by John Fisher, recommends that Caltrans adopt an official sign, “Transporting Illegal Fireworks Prohibited”.

Motion carried 7-0

**Action:** Caltrans will develop the standards and specification for the sign.

### **07-5 Proposal to Amend Section 2C.29 Advance Traffic Control Signs (W3-1, W3-2, W3-3, W3-4)**

Chairman Mansourian asked Devinder Singh to address agenda item 07-5.

Devinder briefed the Committee about the proposed amendment and the reason for placing this item on the agenda. He stated that the existing “shall not” is proposed to be changed to “should not”. The existing text prohibits the use of a warning beacon or WHEN FLASHING plaque to supplement the BE PREPARED TO STOP sign. It is not clear why this manner of application is such a strong prohibition compared to the MUTCD language. Caltrans Electrical Branch’s opinion, the use of “When Flashing” is an operative risk and the effectiveness is an issue. The Electrical Branch believes that the use of “When Flashing” should be discouraged, but reasons are not strong enough to justify a prohibition.

Devinder stated that in some cases, depending upon the sight distance, grade, curve radii and other site-specific conditions, or a traffic signal immediately downstream of a crest vertical curve, in the judgment of the engineer their use could improve the safety of the roadway. The existing prohibition unnecessarily takes away this tool from the engineer to use in such narrow applications. Changing the text to “should not” still discourages its use but does allow the engineer to use his discretion and use these devices where they may be effective.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Ahmad Rastegapour, Caltrans, stated that there was a “Prepare to Stop” (PTS) “When Flashing” sign on state highway, and due to failure of electricity the sign was not working and a collision occurred. The party involved in the incident sued the State. Now, in order to make sure the flashing beacons (FB) are operating properly, they are connected to an electrical circuit for the signals. There is a need for communication between the FB and the signals. Caltrans does not want to combine the PTS “When Flashing” and FB. The current language “shall” means that “When Flashing” shall not be mixed with the PTS sign.

John Fisher noted that there is confusion with the current language. He stated that FB could be used with a “stop ahead” sign, “signal ahead”, or be prepared to stop where the stationary sign is present. According to the current language, the agencies can not use FB with the “stop ahead” sign or “signal ahead” sign or be prepared to stop where the stationary sign is present. He also noted that W16-13p sign is not permitted in the CA MUTCD. He suggested removing the whole paragraph, “Standards” from Section 2C.29 of the CA MUTCD.

Chairman Mansourian asked for his recommendations.

**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommending Caltrans to consider removing the whole paragraph Standards, Section 2C.29 of the CA MUTCD:

**Standard:**

A warning beacon or WHEN FLASHING (W16-13p) plaque shall not be used to supplement the BE PREPARED TO STOP (W3-4) sign. Studies indicate that these devices are generally not effective as warning devices for motorists approaching signalized intersections. The non-use of a warning beacon or WHEN FLASHING (W16-13p) plaque also addresses the situation when a warning beacon is inoperative for any reason.

Motion carried 6-1 (Devinder Singh abstained)

**Action:** Caltrans will inform the Committee when this takes place.

**07-6 Delete the symbolic NO TURN ON RED (R10-11) sign**

Chairman Mansourian asked Johnny Bhullar to address agenda item 07-6 to delete the symbolic “No Turn On Red” sign.

Johnny Bhullar stated that R10-11 signs are word message and symbol signs are much more clear and easy to understand. During the CA MUTCD adoption process, the majority of the word message signs were deleted in favor of the symbol signs. The word message sign with red ball is a confusing, and to be consistent, Caltrans asked the Committee to make a recommendation to delete R10-11, R10-11a and R10-11b in favor of R13A (CA), R13B (CA) and SR39A (CA).

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments and there were none.

There were no comments from the Committee members.

**Motion:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Jacob Babico, recommended that the proposed symbol sign be adopted and the word sign be deleted.

Motion Carried 7-0.

**Action:** Caltrans will replace the word message signs with symbol signs.

#### **06-4 Older CA Traffic Safety Task Force (OCTSTF) Meeting Pending item**

Chairman Mansourian asked Divider Singh to address agenda item 06-4.

Devinder told the Committee that this is an item which was deferred when the Committee adopted recommendations from the OCTSTF. Devinder invited Johnny Bhullar to address this item because Johnny worked with the OCTSTF on this task.

Johnny Bhullar stated that this is one of the remaining items from the OCTSTF which was discussed during the CTCDC workshop. The proposal will increase the delineation devices to double which are used in the work zone areas to the current standards. To put closer at this item, the Committee's action is needed.

Chairman asked for comments from the public.

There were none.

Devinder handed out a letter to Committee members written by David Royer, Consultant Traffic & Highway Engineer. In the letter, David pointed out that the proposal would require twice the number of channelization devices to be carried to each work site and to be set-up and then removed. This change would nearly double the cost to provide and maintain work zone traffic control at each and every work zone each, everyday throughout California. Furthermore, there is no compelling evidence that more devices would be helpful to older drivers.

Devinder asked the Committee to deny this proposal because it would be a financial burden on agencies without any compelling evidence. If there is a problem at the national level, let FHWA adopt this proposal in the MUTCD, and then California could reconsider it.

There were no other comments.

**Motion:** Moved by Devinder Singh, seconded by Jacob Babico, recommended Caltrans to deny this proposal and do not adopt in California.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments on the motion.

Merry banks stated that she likes the proposal, however if it a financial burden and a safety concern for the field staff when they are installing and retrieving the devices, for that reason, she will not push for adoption.

Joe Whiteford stated that he was the chair of the OCTSTF and he does want to create hardship for the jurisdictions.

Motion carried 6-1 (Merry Banks abstained).

**Action:** Item closed and no further action needed.

## **5. Request for Experimentation**

### **06-5 Clear The Way Signage (Drive Damaged Vehicle to Shoulder**

Chairman Mansourian asked Joe Whiteford to address the agenda item "Clear The Way Signage."

Joe Whiteford stated that the proposal will help to reduce secondary collisions and also would be helpful to reduce congestion by moving the vehicle out of the travelway. Joe invited Radiant Victor to share the proposal with the Committee.

Radiant Victor, MTC, stated to the Committee that CHP partnering with MTC and Caltrans D4 are requesting approval to experiment with "Clear The Way" signage. The sign will be installed on Route 880 between Oakland and Hayward. There will be a total of 15 signs in both directions. The purpose of the sign is to educate the public that they are allowed by law to move their vehicle prior to the arrival of a law enforcement officer if there is no injury in the collision and the vehicle is safe to drive to the shoulder. She stated that there would be a study to find out whether signage is effective. The source of the study will be the freeway service patrol, tow servicing companies, and CHP. She stated that there are a few samples of the sign in the agenda packet which are used by different states. However they will prefer to use signs showing two cars head-to-head with "No Injury Drive To The Shoulder". Radiant Victor asked the Committee to approve their experimentation request.

Chairman Mansourian asked the Committee members if they have questions for Radiant Victor.

Devinder asked who will pay for the signs and who will install these signs.

Radiant Victor responded that MTC will pay for the signs and Caltrans D4 has agreed to install the signs.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the requested sign has a symbol and FHWA is very strict on states creating their own symbols.

Jacob Babico stated that there is similar symbol sign which shows towing of a vehicle and he further stated that this is an experimental request.

Chairman Mansourian stated that both Johnny and Jacob raised good questions. Since this is an experimental request, he would suggest to MTC that they consider two signs for experimentation, one with symbol and one without symbol, and during their study they could include in the survey and ask motorists which sign is more effective.

John Fisher stated that there is a standard symbol RG-010 on page 2H-17 of the CA MUTCD which could be used head-to-head for the proposed sign. He added that as long as the MTC uses that symbols, it would be acceptable.

Radiant Victor asked for clarification on whether the MTC has to use two signs for experimentation.

Chairman Mansourian stated if there is a standard symbol available then they do not need to use two different signs for experimentation. He suggested using two signs when he was not aware that a standard symbol is available to use.

Charles Gray, CHP, stated that the Caltrans staff has told him that if the symbol is not standard, then the symbol on the proposed could not be used.

John Fisher stated that the recommendation is to use symbol RG-010 which is a standard and included in the MUTCD and CA MUTCD. John Fisher further asked what type of sign this would be.

Devinder responded that there is CVC Section 20002 in regards to this issue, therefore he believes it should be white on black.

John Fisher stated that there are some unnecessary words on the sign such as “clear the way advisory” and it should be removed from the final sign.

Radiaht Victor responded that is not an apart of the sign.

There were no further comments.

**Motion:** Moved by Merry Banks, seconded by Ed von Borstel, to authorize experimentation with a sign showing two cars colliding with a message “no injury drive safely to shoulder” as requested by the MTC. The symbol for the car will be used from CA the MUTCD, RG-010, shown on page 2H-17.

Motion Carried 7-0.

Chairman Mansourian asked the CHP and MTC, if the symbol sign becomes an issue, in that case, would MTC and CHP consider using a word message sign. If they agreed to the comment, then they do not need to come back again to the Committee for approval.

Radiaht Victor agreed with the suggestion.

Committee members agreed with the Chairman’s comments.

**Action:** Item approved for experimentation.



### **07-7 Experimentation by Implementation of Two New School Site Loading Signs**

Chairman Mansourian stated that before the Committee addresses this agenda item he would like to share a topic related to this request. During the last meeting, there was a request from the City/County of San Francisco to address the non standard "No Parking" signs which are not compliance with the CA MUTCD, however, those signs has been installed on streets in the City/County of San Francisco. A subcommittee was established during the last meeting, which was chaired by John Fisher. Other members were from the County of San Diego, City of Sacramento, County of San Bernardino, and City and County of San Francisco. He asked John Fisher if he would share their finding with the Committee.

John Fisher stated that on August 14, 2006, the Committee received a letter from the City/County of San Francisco stating that they have a number of "No Parking" signs in the field that are not compliant with the CA MUTCD or MUTCD. They requested to the Committee to review those signs and advised the City/County to make them legal. He added that the Subcommittee did research on the parking signs which are mentioned in the CVC. There are number of Sections in the CVC that talks about different types of "no parking" signs, however, there is no standard sign available for some of the CVC Sections.

John Fisher further stated that he has identified a number of CVC Sections which prohibit "no parking", and most of them pertain to loading zones, overnight parking, street sweeping, etc. The Subcommittee has reviewed those Sections of the CVC and discussed how to address them. For loading zones, the thought was to use a concept which is widely used in California, that is, whatever the associated curb color is, the sign should reflect the same color. For two-hour parking, the sign is green lettering on white background and the associated curbs is green. No Stopping is a red sign and associated to red curbs, handicapped parking is blue and associated to blue curbs. There are a number of loading zones, such as passenger loading, commercial loading, school bus loading, bus loading, taxi loading, mail deposit, all these signs are spelled out in the CVC.

John Fisher stated that they have developed a number of black on white signs for the white curb, yellow signs for loading zones, special permit signs, and nighttime prohibition of parking. This is the overview what the Committee has done so far.

John further added that last month there was an idea to use more symbol signs instead of word message signs to designate passenger-loading zones. The symbol signs proposed are for passenger loading next to school zones. The Subcommittee believes that some of the symbol signs could be used for other loading zones. John fisher discussed the handout which illustrates symbol signs. The bottom of the page shows symbol signs. The feedback on this concept will be useful to finalize the "No parking" item brought to the Committee by the City/County of San Francisco.

John stated this is where the Subcommittee is at this point. Eighty percent of the task has been completed, and by the next meeting, the Sub Committee will submit a final product for the full committee to review and take action.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the information shared by John Fisher is not for hearing, this was what the Subcommittee has done so far, and it was information for the City of San Francisco to see whether the work done by the Subcommittee was duplicating the experimental request they have on the agenda.

### **Chairman Mansourian asked Merry Banks to introduce agenda item 07-7, proposed school site loading signs.**

Merry Banks stated that AAA is involved with the San Francisco community to provide safe school zones and spend a large amount of funds to educate motorists about this. Merry stated that AAA works with the

City of San Francisco to improve the safety of school children. She introduced Joren Kroll, Assistant Engineer, City and County of San Francisco, and Roger Bazely, SF PTA, and asked Joren Kroll to address the City's proposal.

Joren Kroll stated that the City and County of San Francisco is requesting approval to experiment with two school loading signs, and a mock-up of the signs are included in the agenda packet. The first sign is on page 37 of the agenda, and it is a school passenger loading sign. The second sign is on page 38, and it is a school bus loading sign. The City/County wants to experiment with a sign that shows a tow-away logo. He stated that many of the jurisdictions do not want to use a tow-away logo. However, the City/County of San Francisco wants to experiment with the option of a tow-away logo. The school bus loading sign without tow-away logo has a minor incorrect message, at the bottom of sign it says, "for towed vehicles call -----." This message should not be there because this sign is without the tow-away option. In the City of San Francisco there are a number of problems in school zones such as commercial loading and unloading, congestion, passenger vehicles, etc. The proposed sign has a strong message indicating that this is for loading and unloading of school passengers and school buses. The City/County believes that the message of the sign addresses the issues. The proposed sign is from the MUTCD, and only the additions are assembly components. The City/County will gather surveys consisting of site photos, motorist behavior, compliance observations at peak AM and PM loading times at selected school sites that are signed with the experimental signs for a period of 12 months, with semi-annual progress reports. A copy of the final results will be sent to the CTCDC within three months following the evaluation period of the experimentation. Joren Kroll asked for approval.

Chairman Mansourian asked whether the Committee members have questions for Joren Kroll.

Merry Banks commented that in San Francisco, people park their vehicles in "no parking" zones and collect citations, and when they have collected a few, they pay for the fine because they knew if they have parked their vehicle in a parking garage they will pay the same amount. The reason for adding tow-away is to warn them that their vehicle will be towed away if they parked in the school loading zones. She noted that other jurisdictions might not have the same issues as SF does.

Jacob Babico commented on the proposed sign, that the message calls it a loading zone, however in the morning there will be unloading or dropped off.

Joe Whiteford asked whether San Francisco has problems in regards to the blocking of loading zones where the school children have to walk on the street to get in or get off of the bus or from the parent's vehicles.

Joren Kroll responded that is a problem.

John Fisher stated that he liked the proposal, however, the proposed sign is using a "school" plaque which is used for other school signs, such as with Assemblies A, B, C, D and E. It is important to use the "school" plaque for those assemblies. A loading zone is a loading zone if it is adjacent to a school, it will be a school loading/unloading zone. He does not believe it is essential to add a "school" plaque with loading zone signs. The loading zone sign is an enforceable sign. The tow-away message is a good tool for the problems you have in the City of San Francisco. He commented on the size of the "hours" numeral. He stated that it looks like the numeral size is approximately 1", however the standard numeral size is 2 1/2" and it stands out. The proposed sign has multiple colors, yellow, red, and black. The associated curb for the loading zone is white because it is a loading zone. There is no need to add "no stopping or no parking" because it is signed as a loading zone and there is a tow-away message. The parents are going to stop to drop off and pick up children, and school buses too. He stated that he would like to see comments from other Committee member's on this proposal.

Joren Kroll responded that the purpose of the school plaque is to inform the public this is a school-loading zone. He further added that very occasionally people leave their cars parked in school loading zones and the tow-away message will warn them about leaving their cars during school hours.

John Fisher stated that there is no need to have “no parking or no stopping” because people are allowed to drop their children or relatives, and they will stop or park during dropping off and picking up. The CVC does not call out separate school loading zones, it only talks about passenger loading zones. When a loading zone is adjacent to a school boundary, it becomes a school loading zone, therefore, there is no need to add a “school” plaque and a “no parking/no stopping” message on the proposed experimental sign.

Chairman Mansourian asked what is the idea to add a “school” plaque with the loading sign? Is this for more compliance and more awareness?

Joren Kroll responded yes, the “school” plaque would warn the motorists that they are in a school zone.

Roger Bazely, SF PTA, stated that the purpose of these two new school loading signs is to create uniform and clear messaging to increase driver awareness, direct traffic in school zones, reduce vehicle loading conflicts and congestion during school operation hours, and reduce related school children’s pedestrian and traffic collisions during the peak school drop-off/arrival and pick-up/departure times at school sites. Roger added that in school zones, the pedestrian and traffic collisions are involved with dropping a child off on the opposite side of the street, vehicles speeding, and making U turns at schools, double parking, and congestion blocking view of children. There is a mix of cars and school buses in the same loading zone speeding in and around active school zones.

Roger added that the purpose of “school plaque and tow-away” is to warn motorists who leave their vehicle parked during school hours. He further added that in San Francisco, they have created a safety zone around the school boundaries by adding a new yellow ladder style crosswalk adjacent to all K-12 school sites, new fluorescent advance school pedestrian and crosswalk signs, and pedestrian countdown signals to increase motorist awareness and compliance in operating motor vehicles in and around school zones. Additionally, school-crossing guards has been funded at selected school sites where needed, as well as motorist awareness and Pedestrian Injury Prevention educational workshops.

Roger Bazely stated that he supports and requests the Committee for the approval of experimentation with the proposed school loading signs.

John Fisher asked what type and color of signs the City has used before.

Joren Kroll stated that the previous sign says “No Stopping” from X – X hour’s school days. And the sign was black on white background.

John Fisher stated that he understands the need of the school plaque and tow-away message on the sign. However by doing so, the Committee is opening the door to use “school” plaque on other signs and this will lessen the importance of the sign for the purpose it has been used. The “school” plaque is prescribed for specific purpose. Also, the proposed signs have a warning message with a regulatory message. The children symbol and school building indicates the presence of a school.

Chairman Mansourian stated that since this is experimental, he would suggest using one sign with the “school” plaque and one without, for experimentation, to see whether the “school” plaque make any difference.

John Fisher stated that he put a lot of effort on the no parking signs, which was brought to the Committee's attention by the City/County of San Francisco during the last meeting. When a sign says taxi-loading zone, you do not use a message such as "no parking or no stopping" because taxi's are parked there.

Chairman Mansourian again suggested allowing the "school" plaque on one sign and the second sign without the "school" plaque to be used for experimentation.

**Motion:** Moved by Merry Banks, seconded by John Fisher, authorizing experimentation as proposed by the City, with modification using "school" plaque on one sign and a second sign without "school" plaque. The numeral for hours should be standard size.

Motion Carried 7-0.

**Action:** Item approved for experimentation.

## **07-8 Experiment with Speed Limit Numbers on Green Traffic Signal Phase**

Chairman Mansourian asked George Allen, City of Garden Grove, to address agenda item 07-8 to experiment with speed limit numbers on green signals.

George Allen stated that the City of Garden Grove is requesting permission to conduct an experiment with a plastic speed limit number on the green signal to advise motorists about the speed limit on a particular street. The numbers will be used only on the main street and not on side streets. There are 13 intersections which will be used for this experimentation. Most of the time, motorists are not aware of the speed limit, and this will advise motorists about the speed limit on a particular street. George pointed out page 3 of the handout given to the committee showing the plastic numbers. The numbers are centered on the green indication and do not reduce the effectiveness of the green signal. George added that this concept has support from the local police department, and the City of Anaheim and Santa Ana. The City of Garden Grove will enter into an agreement with the CTCDC that the sites will be restored to their original condition after the experiment or at any time by the direction of the CTCDC. George stated that the city will study the device for one year, prior and after data will be collected on the speed surveys between each intersection for both directions, one-year accident data and one-year citations. The report will be submitted to the Committee for review and final recommendations. George introduced Allen Fisher who developed this concept.

Allen Fisher stated that the reason he developed this concept was because over the years he learned that most drivers are not aware of the speed limit they are driving on, and have had complaints from citizen who received traffic citations because speed limit signs are normally posted after the major intersection on arterial and collector roadways. With this device, drivers are advised at each signalized intersection what the existing speed limit is for that section of a roadway. The driver always looks at the signal lights and this number will remind them about the speed limit on that roadway.

George asked Allen Fisher to demonstrate one signal with the numbers on the green signal.

Allen Fisher demonstrated the device to the Committee members and to the audience.

George asked if the Committee had any question for him.

Merry Banks asked if the follow-up survey would ask motorists what they think about the signal. Also, what about the opinions of those that don't get surveyed.

George Allen stated that to educate the public about this concept, the City will send out flyers, use the City TV channels, and also uses the City agenda. People will be reminded about the concept and about the numbers used on green signals.

Jacob Babico commented that the City has put together a good packet. He asked whether the numbers would be installed on all the green signal heads.

George responded that the speed numbers would be installed on all the green signals except the left turn signal.

Chairman Mansourian stated that even though this is not a public hearing, he would like to give an opportunity to the public to make comments if they have any.

Matt Schmitz, FHWA, stated that this concept surfaced a few months back, and at that time he contacted their Headquarter team for interpretation on the proposal. Their response was that FHWA would not support or approve this concept.

Chairman Mansourian stated to Matt that this is an experiment, and the City could do experiments with the proposed device. If the device determines to be successful, then it is up to the Committee or FHWA to go to the next level, to adopt or reject it.

Matt Schmitz stated that if the City gets authorization from the CTCDC to conduct the experiment, FHWA would say that it is not in the parameters of the MUTCD.

George Allen stated that the concept is not changing the traffic control device, and as long as there is no change, it should be acceptable.

Johnny Bhullar stated that he is not clear what message the motorists will get. When he looks at the numbers, he will think whether this is a speed limit, or the speed at which he is driving, or the intersection number. He further added that as long as the proposal is not in violation of the MUTCD, then it should not be a problem.

Matt Schmitz stated that the MUTCD team would call this a violation of the MUTCD.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the Committee members.

John Fisher congratulated the City on the quality of the presentation and document submitted to the Committee. Intersections shown are well striped and delineated. He stated that he is not convinced that there is a need or a need has been established. The new traffic control device is to fill gaps and he sees there is no gap. There are speed limit signs that can be used on the roadway to inform motorists about the speed limit. The sign can be enlarged for more visibility if there is a problem. He will not support this concept because he believes that a need has not been established

Joe Whiteford stated that he believes that it is a good idea, motorists are multi-tasking while they drive, such as using cell phones, eating, or putting on make-ups, and they could easily miss the speed limit sign. However, everybody looks at the signals, and this will be a useful tool to remind them about the speed limit.

Merry Banks sees there is a benefit. She is not sure if they will understand it or not. She stated that the peds countdown signal ahead were the same way in the beginning. However, with educational tools, people understood the meaning.

Devinder suggested approving the experiment subject to FHWA approval.

Chairman Mansourian stated that he would support the experiment if the proposal is not in violation of the MUTCD. He added that the City has mentioned that they will seek approval from the FHWA anyhow.

Jacob agreed with the conditions that if it is not a violation of the MUTCD and subject to FHWA approval.

There were no other comments.

**Motion:** Moved by Merry Banks, seconded by Ed von Borstel, authorizing the City of Garden Grove to conduct experimentation with the speed limit numbers on green signal, as long as it is not in violation of the MUTCD standards.

Motion carried 6-1 (John Fisher voted no)

Chairman asked Johnny Bhullar to check if the proposal is or is not in violation of the MUTCD and communicate with the Secretary of the Committee, so that he can share that with Committee members as well as with the City of Garden Grove. He also asked the City to get approval from FHWA even though it was not part of the motion.

**Note: Based upon the review of the California MUTCD, this item is in direct conflict with the MUTCD Section 4D.18 Standard text. Following is the text (which is actually an MUTCD text that has been adopted for California without any modification):**

**"Letters or numbers shall not be displayed as part of a vehicular signal indication."**

**Action:** It was informed to City that if they would like to continue with this experiment, they must receive approval from the FHWA.

## **6. Discussion Items**

### **06-12 No Parking Signs**

John Fisher discussed this item under the agenda item 07-7, experiment with School Loading Signs.



## **07-9 California MUTCD – Procedure for updating the document**

Chairman Mansourian asked Johnny Bhullar to address the procedure for updating the CA MUTCD.

Johnny stated that before he talks about the updating process, he would like to share information about the printing of the CA MUTCD with the Committee members and audience. Caltrans was struggling on whether to print or not to print the CA MUTCD. Due to budgetary restrictions, Caltrans has decided not to print the document. However, the contents of the California MUTCD are not copyrighted. They may be reprinted freely. The California MUTCD can be freely published and made available for purchase by anyone. Caltrans has decided not to publish the California MUTCD. The electronic version of the [California MUTCD](#) is posted on the web site and is the official California Department of Transportation publication and can be downloaded and printed for use.

More information on availability of hard copies is posted under the [Publications](#) link in the left column at the following website:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/index.htm>

Johnny Bhullar stated that he would like to asked the Committee members their ideas on how to update the CA MUTCD, to include ongoing recommendations from the CTCDC that are adopted by Caltrans. He stated that if the FHWA issues any policy between updates, they are calling them Interim Approval, and they are posted on the MUTCD website under the Interim Approval link. He suggested that Caltrans also could do something similar, however he would like to get input from the Committee. The FHWA updates the MUTCD every 3-5 years, and their next target update year is 2008. Caltrans could also have a span of 3 to 5 years to update the CA MUTCD, unless the Committee and Caltrans want updates in between.

John Fisher stated that the recommendations from the Committee which are adopted by Caltrans should be kept separate on the CA MUTCD website, and future updates of the CA MUTCD would include these changes in the effected sections.

Chairman Mansourian stated that it would be helpful for the public agencies and for the other practitioners if Caltrans post all new polices on the website before they are included in the CA MUTCD.

Devinder asked Johnny Bhullar whether it is possible to create a heading "CA MUTCD interim policies", similar to the FHWA Interim Approval.

Johnny responded that could be done.

In conclusion, the Committee members and Johnny agreed to place all the new policies on the CA MUTCD website until they are included into the CA MUTCD.

### **07-10 Application of In-Roadway Warning Lights (IRWLs) at Yield controlled intersections**

Chairman Mansourian asked Devinder to address agenda item 07-10.

Devinder told the Committee that the City of Pasadena asked whether IRWLs could be used with a yield sign. Devinder asked Johnny Bhullar, who knows exactly what the city asking for.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the issue was raised by City of Pasadena and it merits further discussion and, if needed, a change to the current policy. He stated that Section 4L.02 of the CA MUTCD states as follows:

#### **Section 4L.02 In-Roadway Warning Lights at Crosswalks**

##### **Standard:**

**If used, In-Roadway Warning Lights at crosswalks shall be installed only at marked crosswalks with applicable warning signs. They shall not be used at crosswalks controlled by YIELD signs, STOP signs, or traffic control signals.**

He stated that the City of Pasadena raised the following questions:

- The City understands not installing the IRWL's at stops and traffic signals but why is it a conflict to install them at yield controlled approaches?
- Aren't IRWL's considered a warning device that sends the same message, i.e., YIELD to pedestrians?

The interpretation by the City of Pasadena of this section is that the paddle sign (R1-6) shown in the CA MUTCD, page 2B-58 is equivalent to a yield sign, as it instructs motorists to yield to pedestrians, and therefore can not be used with IRWL. Do you agree?

The City further asked why IRWL are prohibited at YIELD controlled crosswalks when in fact it sends the same message as a YIELD sign.

John Fisher stated that IRWLs are beacons that warn motorists, and the yield sign is a regulatory sign. He stated that mis-matching warning devices with regulatory messages for the same situation is not clear to the motorists. If a pedestrian is in the crosswalk, the motorists must yield to the pedestrian. However if a pedestrian is on a curb or on the sidewalk, then motorists are not required to yield. He believes there has not been a need established to use IRWL with a yield sign.

Chairman Mansourian asked whether any Committee members would recommend placing this issue on the CTCDC agenda under the action items for further discussion and action.

None of the Committee responded.

Action – Item closed.

## **7. Information Items**

### **00-4 Use of Raised Pavement Markers in Transverse Pattern**

Chairman Mansourian asked Devinder to share this item with Committee members.

Devinder stated that during the February 15, 2001 CTCDC meeting a motion was passed as follows:

**MOTION:** Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Wayne Tanda, recommending Caltrans adopt the language on RPMs from the MUTCD 2000 and place it in the State Traffic Manual. Motion carried 7-0.

Since as of September 26 2006, Caltrans has adopted CA MUTCD and Section 3B.15 Transverse Marking has been adopted in the CA MUTCD. Caltrans requests that the Committee makes a recommendation to remove this item from "Caltrans Action Items". The CA MUTCD language is as follows:

#### **Section 3B.15 Transverse Markings**

##### **Standard:**

**Transverse markings, which include shoulder markings, word and symbol markings, stop lines, yield lines, crosswalk lines, speed measurement markings, speed hump markings, parking space markings, and others, shall be white unless otherwise specified herein.**

##### **Guidance:**

Because of the low approach angle at which pavement markings are viewed, transverse lines should be proportioned to provide visibility equal to that of longitudinal lines.

##### **Standard:**

**Pavement marking letters, numerals, and symbols shall be installed in accordance with the Pavement Markings chapter of the "Standard Highway Signs" book (see Section 1A.11).**

**Crosswalk markings near schools shall be yellow. Refer to CVC 21368 and Part 7.**

##### **Support:**

Refer to Department of Transportation's Standard Plans for pavement marking letters, numerals and symbols. See Section 1A.11 for information regarding this publication

Committee members agreed to remove this item from the pending items.

### 02-3 Right Edgeline

Chairman Mansourian asked Devinder to share this item with Committee members.

Devinder stated that the Committee recommended that Caltrans develop a policy to allow the use of raised pavement markings at the right edgeline. The policy should create a different pattern of markers compared to lane line and left edgeline. A motion was passed during the May 8, 2002 CTCDC meeting as follows:

*edgeline, an engineering study should be conducted documenting the reasons for their use and the marking should* **MOTION:** Moved by Wayne Tanda, seconded by Farhad Mansourian, adopting the proposed verbiage with amendment as follows:

*“ In general, raised pavement markers should not be used to supplement the right edgeline. The use of raised pavement markers on the right edgeline may lead the motorists to believe there is another lane to the right of the markers. If either retroreflective or non-reteroreflective raised pavement markers are used on a right be consistent with the guidelines contained in the Traffic Manual. ”*

Motion passed 8-0.

However, when Caltrans discussed this policy in house, there was resistance to implement the CTCDC recommendation. One of the reasons was that the federal language says: Raised pavement markers should not substitute for right edge line markings.

Devinder asked that Caltrans requests the Committee to make a recommendation to remove this item from the “Caltrans Action Items”.

John Fisher stated that the Committee discussed this item in numerous meetings and spent a number of hours to make a recommendation to Caltrans. The Committee would appreciate it if Caltrans can share their thought during those discussions and provide clear direction.

Devinder asked to take this item back, share your concerns again, then update the Committee during the next meeting.

Chairman Mansourian and John Fisher stated they do not want pursues any further. Although they will appreciate Caltrans input during discussion of the item, they feel it is not beneficial to CA.

**8. Tabled Item**

**03-14 Numbering of Signalized Intersections**

Devinder told the Committee that he has received the final conclusions from the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG), and he will place this under the action items for the Committee's review.

**9. Next Meeting**

The next CTCDC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 7, 2007, Caltrans D11 Office in San Diego, California.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM. Motion was moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by Ed von Borstel. Motion carried 7-0.